

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION  
No. 5:19-CV-509-D

SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, LLC,     )  
                                                           )  
Plaintiff,                                     )  
                                                           )  
v.                                                 )  
                                                           )  
ATTICUS, LLC,                                )  
                                                           )  
Defendant.                                    )

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's motion to seal portions of its Proposed Reply in Support of its Second Motion to Maintain Confidentiality Designations. Plaintiff seeks to seal this information on the ground it contains sensitive business information. (Mot. Seal [DE #593] at 1.) Plaintiff has filed a proposed redacted version of the filing, omitting the portions it contends should not be available to the public.


For the reasons set forth in Plaintiff's motion and supporting memorandum, the court finds that the public's common law right of access is outweighed by Plaintiff's interests in protecting against competitive and/or financial harm to Plaintiff were such information made public. *In re Knight Publ'g Co.*, 743 F.2d 231 (4th Cir. 1984). Public notice of Plaintiff's request to seal and a reasonable opportunity to object have been provided by the filing of its motion. Defendant filed a response in opposition to Plaintiff's motion to seal, which it has since withdrawn (*see* Jt. Stip. Dismissal [DE #655] at 1 (withdrawing opposition to Plaintiff's motion to

seal)), and no other objections have been filed with the court. Plaintiff has narrowly tailored its request to remove only information that is sensitive and confidential and not otherwise publicly known. Furthermore, the parties have since settled all matters in controversy between them. Consequently, the sealed document will not be the subject of any ruling by the court. Plaintiff's motion is therefore allowed.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion to Seal [DE #593] is GRANTED. It is ORDERED that Plaintiff's Proposed Reply in Support of its Second Motion to Maintain Confidentiality Designations [DE #592] be SEALED. A redacted version is available at DE #594-2.

This 29th day of December 2022.

  
KIMBERLY A. SWANK  
United States Magistrate Judge